

# 2006-2007 SES PRELIMINARY EVALUATION REPORT

## DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

**PROVIDER NAME:** **Tools of Empowerment**

**DISTRICTS SERVED:** **Indianapolis Public Schools**

**# OF STUDENTS SIGNED UP:** **751** (English/Language Arts); **634** (Mathematics)

## 2006-2007 EVALUATION GRADES (see report below for details)

**CUSTOMER SATISFACTION:** **B+**

(How satisfied are districts, schools, and parents with the services that the provider offered)?

**SERVICE DELIVERY:** **C+**

(How well did the provider implement services, and to what extent did the provider implement its program with fidelity to its originally approved application)?

**ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS:** **B**

(Is the provider increasing the academic achievement of the students it served)?

## CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

### PARENT REPORT

% of parents reporting: 2%

Overall score: 3.5 out of 4.0

### DISTRICT REPORT

% of districts served reporting: 100%

District recommends continuation?: 100% of districts recommend continuation

### PRINCIPAL REPORT

% of principals reporting: 31%

Overall Score: 2.5 out of 4.0

**CUSTOMER SATISFACTION GRADE:** **B+**

## SERVICE DELIVERY

### PARENT REPORT

% of parents reporting:	2%
Overall score:	3.3 out of 4.0

### DISTRICT REPORT:

% of districts reporting:	100%
Overall score:	89% (16/18 possible points)

### PRINCIPAL REPORT:

% of principals reporting:	31%
Overall score:	2.8 out of 4.0

<b>ONSITE MONITORING/COMPLIANCE:</b>	3.0 out of 4.0
--------------------------------------	----------------

Go to ([http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/dg/ses/pdf/OnSiteMonitor0607/Tool's%20On-site%20monitoring%20Report%20\(Final%20Compiled%20Report%203-30-07\).pdf](http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/dg/ses/pdf/OnSiteMonitor0607/Tool's%20On-site%20monitoring%20Report%20(Final%20Compiled%20Report%203-30-07).pdf)) to view the Onsite Monitoring Report from 2006-2007

**SERVICE DELIVERY GRADE:** **C+**

## ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS

<b>COMPLETION RATE:</b>	65%
<b>% OF STUDENTS MEETING GOALS</b>	100%
<b>TYPE OF ASSESSMENT USED BY PROVIDER:</b>	Grade Placement/Key Math
<b>% OF STUDENTS SHOWING GAINS</b>	96%
<b>% OF STUDENTS WHO ATTENDED 80% OR MORE SESSIONS:</b> (Based on # attending 80% / # served who attended at least one session)	84.1%

In order to be included in the ISTEP+ analysis provided below, students must have completed 80% of their SES sessions, must not have been retained from 2006 to 2007, and must have ISTEP+ scores for both 2006 and 2007.

## ISTEP+ DATA (included in academic effectiveness grade):

### SES STUDENTS ONLY: ISTEP+ RESULTS

For students served by Tools of Empowerment in 2006-2007, 65% made scale score gains on ISTEP+ in English/Language Arts, and 68% made scale score gains in Math, which trailed the statewide average for all SES students in both subjects. 46% of students made one year's growth in English/Language Arts and Math, again trailing the statewide average in both subjects. The percentage of students passing ISTEP+ decreased from 48% to 47% in English/Language Arts, and from 55% to 52% in Math.

Category	Tools of Empowerment (E/LA)	All SES Students Statewide (E/LA)*	Tools of Empowerment (Math)	All SES Students Statewide (Math)*
# of students	222	1675	221	1645
% showing growth on ISTEP+ scale score	65%	71%	68%	73%
% showing substantial (one year's) growth on ISTEP+ scale score**	46%	49%	46%	49%
% passing ISTEP+ (2006)	48%	43%	55%	52%
% passing ISTEP+ (2007)	47%	42%	52%	51%

\*Includes all students participating in SES who completed 80% of their sessions, were not retained from grades 2006-2007, and have ISTEP+ scores for 2006 and 2007.

\*\*Substantial growth (one year's growth) is defined as making a large enough scale score gain to pass ISTEP+ from one year to the next.

### SES AND NON-SES STUDENTS MATCHED: ISTEP+ RESULTS

When possible, each student who participated in SES, completed 80% of his or her sessions, and had ISTEP+ scores for both 2006 and 2007 was matched with a similar student who was eligible for but did not participate in SES. SES students were matched with other students from their school on a number of characteristics, including grade in school, race, free/reduced lunch eligibility, special education status, limited English proficiency, and 2006 ISTEP+ scale score. The charts below provide the results of the matched comparison. The matched comparison provides a context in which to place the gains or losses made by SES students. By looking at the charts below, it can be determined whether students served by this SES provider performed about the same as similar students who did not participate in SES; worse than similar students who did not participate in SES; or better than similar students who did not participate in SES. For Tools of Empowerment, 142 matches out of 221 participating students (64%) were made for Math, and 139 matches out of 222 participating students (63%) were made for English/Language Arts.

MATHEMATICS						
	# Matched	% Matched	% showing growth	% showing 1 year's growth	Average growth	% passing (2007)
SES	142	64%	70%	46%	18.1	53%
Not SES			66%	41%	16.8	53%

As shown in the chart above, 70% of the SES students included in the matched comparison showed any growth on ISTEP+ scale score, compared to slightly fewer (66%) of the similar non-SES students. 46% of the SES students showed one year's growth, compared to 41% of the non-SES students. About the same percentage of SES and non-SES students (53%) passed ISTEP+ in 2007.

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS						
	# Matched	% Matched	% showing growth	% showing 1 year's growth	Average growth	% passing (2007)
SES	139	63%	67%	50%	17.3	53%
Not SES			66%	44%	10.8	48%

As shown in the chart above, 67% of the SES students included in the matched comparison showed any growth on ISTEP+ scale score, compared to slightly fewer (66%) of the similar, non-participating students. 50% of SES students showed one year's growth on ISTEP+ scale score, compared to 44% of the non-SES students. A greater percentage of SES students (53%) passed ISTEP+ in 2007 than non-SES students (48%).

**ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS GRADE: B**

**OVERALL GRADE: B-**